

REMARKS

The amendment to Claim 1 is requested due to a typographical error in the Examiner's Amendment.

The amendment to Claim 7 is requested due to miscommunication with the Examiner regarding the Examiner's Amendment.

Prior to the first Office Action, Claims 1-20 were pending. In the first Office Action, Claims 1-3 were rejected, Claims 10-20 were allowed, and Claims 4-9 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter, but were objected to for being dependent on a rejected claim.

In response to the first Office Action, Applicants filed an amendment on July 28, 2005. In the amendment, Claim 1 was amended to include some of the limitations that were previously included in the original Claim 7, and Claim 7 was amended to delete those amendments that were moved to Claim 1. Further, Claims 4, 5, and 6 were amended to be re-written in independent form. Also, new Claims 21 and 22 were added.

The Examiner and Applicant's representative held an Examiner-initiated interview on September 30, 2005. The Examiner indicated that the current status of the Claims was as follows. Claims 1-3 would stand rejected, Claim 21 would be rejected, Claims 10-20 stand allowed, and Claims 4-6 are in condition for allowance. Claims 7-9 would stand allowable objected to as dependent on a rejected Claim (Claim 7 depended directly on Claim 1, and Claims 8 and 9 depend on Claim 7). Claim 22 would be rejected to as having an informality. The Examiner suggested that Claims 1, 21, and 22 should be amended to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant's representative did not agree to the amendments initially suggested by the Examiner, but agreed to consider other possible amendments to Claims 1, 21, and 22. Applicant's representative indicated that if Claim 1 were to ultimately be amended, Claim 7 should be re-written in independent form since it had been identified as being allowable as is if re-written in independent form. After further discussion, including proposals and counter-proposals for possible amendments, the Examiner and Applicant's representative agreed to amendments to Claim 1, 21, and 22. The

The Examiner's Amendment made in the Notice of Allowability reflected the agreed-upon amendment, except as follows.

A typographical error was made in the Examiner's Amendment to Claim 1, which is corrected by way of this amendment.

Also, Applicants' representative wanted Claim 7 to be re-written in independent form based on Claim 7 as it stood prior to the Examiner's amendment. The fact that Claim 7 was not re-written in independent form in the Examiner's amendment appears to be the result of miscommunication between the Examiner and Applicant's representative.

Claims 7-9 were previously identified as being allowable, but were objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim. Accordingly, Claim 7 as amended is patentable, and requires no further search or examination, since Claim 7 was already identified as being allowable if re-written in independent form.

Respectfully submitted,

By Matthew M. Gaffney
 Matthew M. Gaffney
 Registration No.: 46,717
 DARBY & DARBY P.C.
 P.O. Box 5257
 New York, New York 10150-5257
 (206) 262-8900
 (212) 527-7701 (Fax)
 Attorneys/Agents For Applicant